

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 2002
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on April 18, 2002 at Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room (14th Floor).

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: William Cobb, Chairman
Allen Graff, Vice Chairman
Ed Adkison
Paul Bell [Alternate for Paul Gill]
Walt Snyder
Lyle Alberg [Alternate for Marge Tandy]

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Marge Tandy
Jim Potts

OTHERS PRESENT: Leeanne Brock, Del Webb
Jay Dyer
Dave Redding, Riverside Public Utilities
Ron Vergilio
David DeGennaro, DJD Group [present prior to fire drill]

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, A.L.U.C. Executive Director
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Pat Moore, Office Assistant

Due to a fire drill that caused evacuation of the building, the meeting was postponed until 10:00 a.m.

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chairman Cobb.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 21, 2002: Due to the minutes being distributed at the meeting to the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to continue the approval to the next scheduled meeting on May 16th.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to continue approval of the January minutes until the next scheduled ALUC Meeting on March 21st. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Keith Downs suggested using a Consent Calendar format/method due to the meeting's postponement one hour. Chairman Cobb agreed and the meeting proceeded.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. BD-02-100 – Mowers Plus, Inc. – (Continued from March 21st). Keith Downs advised the Commission that the staff report was incorrect and should have been denoted as a continuance, due to a pending FAA 7460 review.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: BD-02-100 – Mowers Plus
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 17507, PM 29976

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to develop a 9,044 sq. ft. 24' high industrial bldg. on a 33,000 sq. ft. parcel.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated at the easterly of Adams St. and south of Country Club Drive in the County of Riverside and immediately adjacent to the west end of Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: *Bermuda Dunes Airport*
a. Airport Influence Area: *Area I and II*
b. Land Use Policy: *Influence Area*
c. Noise Levels: *60 to 70 dB CNEL (February 1996 future forecasts)*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 125 feet north of the west end of the runway and is within Areas I and II of the Airport Influence Area. At the time of the staff report writing the applicant had submitted a 7460 Notice to Construct to the FAA, and a copy of this proposal has been submitted to CalTrans Aeronautics for review (comment attached). The FAA response was not available at the time of the staff report. Existing structures and lots of a similar size are continuous along the north side of the runway. Most of the site is within the Imaginary Surface or Runway Safety Area and the Plan indicates it to be within AREAS II and I. This precludes the following usages:

- (a) *High concentrations of people*
- (b) *Critical Facilities*
- (c) *Flammable or Explosive Material*

Noise: The proposal is within the 60 to 70 CNEL as indicated in the 1996 Noise Report for the airports (See Exhibit C). Any industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates up to 20dB.

Height: Part 77 approach profiles are indicated on the exhibit and overlay all of the property. The runway elevation at the west end is 73 feet. The floor level of the buildings is proposed to be 72 feet.

CONDITIONS: for the County to utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portion of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
4. The following uses are prohibited at this site:
 - A. High Concentration of People
 - (1) Places of Assembly: Auditoriums; churches; schools, carnivals; drive-in theaters.
 - (2) High Patronage Services: Bowling alleys; restaurants; theaters; motels; banks; etc.
 - (3) Large Retail Outlets: Department stores; supermarkets; drug stores; etc.
 - (4) Residential Uses.
 - B. Critical Facilities: Telephone exchanges; radio/television studios; hospitals; etc.
 - C. Flammable Products: Bulk fuel storage; gasoline and liquid petroleum service stations; manufacture of plastics; breweries; feed and flour mills; etc.
5. The establishment of new land uses involving, as a primary activity, the manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are prohibited in this area.
6. The following uses shall be prohibited:

- (1) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (2) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (3) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (4) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
7. *Any subsequent permit shall require an ALUC review.*
 8. *The overall elevation of the structure shall not exceed 95MSL and shall be built in accordance with the submitted plot plan.*
 9. *Lighting shall be installed and notification shall be filed as required under FAA aeronautical study 02-AWP-0632-OE (dated April 02).*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend that the Commission find the proposal consistent with the Bermuda Dunes Airport Land Use Plan.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller inquired if the FAA 7460 was including in the Conditions of Approval. Keith Downs responded positively.

Hearing no further responses from the Commissioner's or opposition from anyone in the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations for a continuance to the next scheduled meeting of May 16th. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The Chairman asked which cases people wished to address. Due to opposition from members of the audience, this case was a non-consent item.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. BD-02-103 – Del Webb - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations and stated that though the project was advertised to the property owners were not notified, and subsequently no action should be taken. He also added that an exhibit was received too late to place in the

agenda package. Therefore, since this was not a 'legal' hearing the case would need to be advertised and re-calendared for the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Downs then advised the ALUC on two options available, either to re-advertise or go forward with the project.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: BD-02-103 - Del Webb California Corp.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Change of Zone 6766
PREVIOUS CASES Specific Plan 281 A5 and Change of Zone 6579

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to change the allowed uses in Planning Areas 15 & 16 to allow nursing homes, congregate care and assisted living uses to Area 15 and allow automobile sales to Area 16 on two separate parcels totaling 49 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated easterly of Washington Street north of Varner Road and west of Adams St. in the County of Riverside and northwesterly of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Area III
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996)

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 4,000-9,000 feet northwest of the west end of the runway near flight tracks 2, 3 and 4 and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Policies in the CLUP indicate that commercial uses would be allowed. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan if the commercial uses were not residential in nature.*

NOISE: *The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60CNEL (1996), but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site. The uses proposed in Area 16 are all noise sensitive uses and as such will require an acoustical study.*

PART 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 97MSL and the height of structures is unknown at this time. The airport elevation is 73MSL and at a distance of 5,000 feet any structure exceeding 26 feet in height would require an FAA 7460 review. At 8,000 feet any structure over an elevation of 153 MSL will require an FAA review.*

LIGHTING: *Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Bermuda Dunes Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and assure a total NLR reduction of 25dba. Any noise sensitive uses in Planning Area 16 shall have an acoustical analysis.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
4. *Any subsequent permit shall have ALUC review.*
6. *Any structure over 20 feet in height in Planning Area 15, or 35 feet in Area 16 shall have an FAA 7460 review completed and any conditions recommended shall be completed and adhered to prior to construction.*
7. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

Chairman Cobb inquired the criterion for a legal hearing, to which Keith Downs responded by stating the following; 1) continue with the hearing, 2) submit a disclaimer with letter denoted the non-advertisement, or 3) take the item off calendar and re-advertise.

Following Chairman Cobb's call for questions from the Commissioners a discussion arose between Commissioner Adkison, B.T. Miller, Commissioner Bell and Chairman Cobb pertaining to the public hearing notice and legalization of the hearing.

Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Leeanne Brock, Del Webb came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation and recommended that since the County was not legally noticed that the project would need to be re-processed.

Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward, upon hearing no reply from the audience; he called for a motion to be set. Another discussion then ensued between Commissioner Adkison, Keith Downs and Commissioner Alberg resulting in the case being continued.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Graff made a motion to continue the project, per staff's recommendations to the next scheduled meeting on May 16th. Commissioner Adkison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Items B, C and G were approved based upon the Consent Calendar method/format.

B. MA-02-121 – 02Wireless Solutions - Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-121 – 02Wireless Solutions
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *City of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Minor CUP*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Minor Conditional Use Permit for adding a Telecommunications Facility to an existing building to a height of 45 feet.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is at 2769 Mary St., within the City of Riverside.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for, we will utilize six resources for our review:

- (a) The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- (b) The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993*
- (c) Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 5. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 6. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*
- 7. PART 77 Obstruction Criteria*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The site is located approximately 30,000 feet northwest of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of demolition addition to a park building at Washington Park. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial, industrial, agriculture and residential.

Density and Coverage: Approximately 80 sq. ft. of structures are proposed at this time.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is 922 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 45 feet. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 1,888 MSL feet in elevation.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have below 55 CNEL.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: for the city to utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the Commission find the project consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan for MARB.

Upon hearing no opposition from any members of the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Adkison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. MA-02-122 – 02Wireless Solutions – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-02 -122 – 02Wireless Solutions
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Minor CUP

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Telecommunications Facility consisting of a 75 ft. Communications Tower and Equipment Shelter on 2.94 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is at 5801 Chicago Avenue within the City of Riverside, northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Area*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

- Since we have not adopted the CLUP for, we will utilize six resources for our review:*
- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
 - 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993*
 - 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
 - 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
 - 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*
 - 6. PART 77 Obstruction Standards*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 30,000 feet northwest of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of the removal of a Monopalm Communications Tower and the construction of a 75 ft. Monopine Communications Tower and Equipment Shelter on a 2.94 acre site. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial, industrial, agriculture, and residential uses.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is between XXXX feet and the maximum building height is 75 feet. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 1,885 MSL feet in elevation.*

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have below 55CNEL.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: for the city to utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Adkison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- D. MA-02-124 – Roy G. Palmer, PE – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations. Mr. Downs advised the Commission that Condition of Approval 4 (b) could be deleted since the FAA 7460 review had been received and the project is now deemed as consistent.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>MA-02-124 - Roy G. Palmer</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO:	CU 029-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A CUP for a 127,000 sq. ft Mini-Storage Facility on 7.5 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Jesse Lane east of Trauwein Road, within the City of Riverside approximately 15,000 to 16,000 feet westerly of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport:	March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area:	Within Area of Influence Area
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels:	See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adopted in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP, we will utilize five resources for our review:

- (d) The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
- (e) The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
- (f) Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
- (g) Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
- (h) 98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,000-16,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a 127,000 sq. ft. mini storage facility with 13 structures on 7.5 acres. The existing site is zoned for (MP) industrial uses. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, and would preclude residential uses. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of APZ Safety Zone II, and within the approach and departure profiles for Runway 14/32. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The 1998 draft placed the property within the APZ II.

Density and Coverage: The number of people on the site varies and would result in maximum densities of 1-10 people per acre averaged over the 7.5 acre site. The structural coverage proposed for the site is approximately 30%.

Part 77: The elevation at the developing portion of this site is 1617MSLfeet and the maximum building height is 26.5 feet. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 1885 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have 55+ CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 65CNEL.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal consistent with the RCALUP.

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in the area. The use, mini- warehousing, is not a High Risk use.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with that proposal. The matrix 'Table I' identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans' criteria.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the area as within TPZ II and within the 60+ CNEL.

Conclusion: The proposal would be consistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT is an update the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end and included this area,
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. PART 77 boundaries.

CalTrans completed a first draft of the text for review, but no further text has been completed. The graphics are completed. The site is within APZ II and uses such as manufacturing and warehousing is allowed.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be consistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP and would require acoustical analysis.

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent

CONDITIONS:

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office and caretaker portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *All outdoor lightings shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either spillage of lumens or reflections into the sky.*
4. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:*
 - (a) *Any proposal for a variance in height limitations of the applicable zone, or for a plot plan or use permit proposing a greater height limit pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be transmitted to the Riverside County ALUC staff for a determination of whether review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission is required. The application for such a proposal shall also provide evidence to the Planning Department that the proposed has been submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or written documentation from the Federal Aviation Administration that such review is not required.*
 - (b) ~~*The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*~~
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*

- (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
- (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
- (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

6. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward.

Jay Dyer came forward and voiced his opposition to the project by stating several factors, such as view obstruction relative to distance between his property and the project, along with noise factors pertaining to foot traffic, entering into storage unit at facility and noise generated from car stereos. Mr. Dyer continued by noting that most mini storage areas are usually located in industrial areas near railroad crossings not in residential areas. He then added that his preference was for the area to be deemed as a 'green belt' or wilderness area.

Chairman Cobb responded by advising Mr. Dyer of the ALUC's role and responsibilities, and directed him to voice these concerns with City of Riverside, Planning Commission.

A comment was made from Mr. Dyer stating that he had only received the public hearing notice 3-4 days prior to the meeting, in which Keith Downs informed him of the ALUC's advertising procedures and that the City of Riverside, Planning Dept. contact information was also made available on said notice.

Chairman Cobb called for other members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward. Upon hearing no response, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's recommendations and deletion of Item 4 (b) from the Conditions of Approval. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the projects MA-02-125 and MA-02-126, to come forward and upon hearing no response or reply and in accordance with the Consent Calendar format Chairman Cobb asked staff to brief the Commission on the projects.

- E. MA-02-125 – Tower Structures – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: MA-02 -125 – Tower Structures
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 013-989

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a 40+-foot Communications Tower on a 1.56 acre site.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is at 599 Central Ave., within the City of Riverside northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

*a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III
c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for, we will utilize six resources for our review:

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*
- 6. PART 77 Obstruction Standards*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 27,000 feet northwest of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a 40+ ft. communications tower and utility building on approximately 1.56 acre site. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial, industrial, agriculture, and residential.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is between 1180 feet and the maximum building height is 40+ feet. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed approximately 1,885 MSL feet in elevation.*

Noise: *The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have below 55CNEL.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: *for the city to utilize*

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*

2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into of any office building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Adkison's requested for the correct exhibit on project depicting Mary St. to be displayed, in response Ms. Coleman apologized and displayed the correct exhibit.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, to which Dave Redding, Riverside Public Utilities came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Mr. Redding noted that the previous fiber optic project on Box Springs had fallen through. He addressed Condition of Approval #1 relating to the aviation easement, and stated that a meeting had been held with the Board's Public Utilities and that another was scheduled on May 7th between Riverside City Council and Orangecrest, to which the easement had been provided. Mr. Redding then requested that the ALUC expedite the permit.

A discussion then ensued between Commissioner Alberg, Chairman Cobb, Commissioner Adkison, Keith Downs, Dave Redding, B.T. Miller, and Commissioner Snyder resulting in Condition of Approval #1 remaining 'as is.'

Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no response or reply, he called for a motion to be set.

Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- F. MA-02-126 – Al Aquirre & Associates – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations. Ms. Coleman noted a correction to the “Density and Coverage” as 1.14 vs. 114 as stated on the staff report.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-126 - Al Aquirre & Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: PM 30111

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map to divide 2.29 acre (gr.) Into 2 lots for single-family housing.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated east of Barton Road and south of Warren Road approximately 15,500 feet westerly of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilizes five resources for our review:

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993*
- 3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994*
- 4. Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 15,500 feet west of Runway 14-32. The site consists of 2 single-family lots on 2.29 acre lot. The existing site is occupied by vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.*

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 65 CNEL. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The surrounding property is developed at a similar density.

Density and Coverage: The lots are each 1.14 acre, and the structural coverage of the site would be less than 10%.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1,700MSL feet and the maximum building height is less than 20 feet. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 2,038 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside the 55 CNEL and is near one major flight track. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 65CNEL.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency of the project subject to the conditions noted above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Alberg seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- G. MA-02-133 – DJD Group – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER:	<u>MA-02-133- DJD Group, Inc.</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO:	RZ-013-012 and CU 074-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Change of Zone from C2X to C3 and a CUP for a 110,076 sq. ft. Mini-Storage Facility on 5.6+ acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Alessandro Blvd. east of Barton Road, within the City of Riverside approximately 14,000 to 15,000 feet northwesterly of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport:	March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area:	Within Area of Influence Area
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels:	See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adopted in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 1999 effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP, we will utilize five resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. 98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 14,000-15,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of a 110,000 sq. ft. mini storage facility with 17 structures on 5.6+ acres. The existing site is zoned for (C-2X) industrial uses. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, and would preclude residential uses. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of APZ Safety Zone II, and within the approach and departure

profiles for Runway 14/32. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The 1998 draft placed the property within the APZ II.

Zoning: The current zoning (C2)X is less restrictive than the proposed zoning (C-3X) and the city is proposing to restrict it to the proposed usage with the larger setbacks (20 and 50 feet)

Density and Coverage: The number of people on the site varies and would result in maximum densities of 1-10 people per acre averaged over the 5.6+acre site. The structural coverage proposed for the site is at 30%.

Part 77: The elevation at the developing portion of this site is 1,640MSLfeet and the maximum building height is 26.5 feet. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 1,685 MSL feet in elevation. Any construction above an elevation of 1,675 will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have 60+ CNEL and is overlain with various flight tracks. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise levels were as high as 70CNEL.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal consistent with the RCALUP.

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in the area. The use, mini- warehousing, is not a High Risk use.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with that proposal. The matrix 'Table I' identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans' criteria.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the area as within TPZ II and within the 65+ CNEL.

Conclusion: The proposal would be consistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT is an update the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end and included this area,
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. PART 77 boundaries.

CalTrans completed a first draft of the text for review, but no further text has been completed. The graphics are completed. The site is within APZ II and uses such as manufacturing and warehousing is allowed.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be consistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP and would require acoustical analysis.

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Consistent

CONDITIONS:

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office and caretaker portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.*
4. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:*
 - (a) *Any proposal for a variance in height limitations of the applicable zone, or for a plot plan or use permit proposing a greater height limit pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be transmitted to the Riverside County ALUC staff for a determination of whether review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission is required. The application for such a proposal shall also provide evidence to the Planning Department that the proposed has been submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or written documentation from the Federal Aviation Administration that such review is not required.*
 - (b) *The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*

- (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
- (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

5. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Adkison seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

DESERT RESORTS REGIONAL AIRPORT 9:45 A.M.

H. TH-02-101 – Palm Desert Dev. Co. - Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: TH-02-101 - Palm Desert Development Corp.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: General Plan Amendment 612, Change of Zone 6663 and Plot Plan 17665

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *Change of Zone No. 6663 proposes to change the zoning from MSC to R-6 and the general plan from Manufacturing to R1-B and build 72 affordable apartments.*

PROJECT LOCATION: *The site is situated east of Polk St., west of Olive St. and south of Church St. in Thermal.*

Adjacent Airport: Desert Resorts Regional Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1992:
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside current 55CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located 4,000-4,500 east of Runway 17-35. The proposed site is within the Traffic Pattern Zone of the Desert Resorts Regional Airport Influence Area. The total site is 5.24 acres.*

NOISE: *The site is underlying a well-used traffic pattern and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft.*

PART 77. The surface elevation varies from –125 to –127. The north runway end is at –118MSL. The site is within the Horizontal Surface, but does not need any FAA review at this time due to the distance from the runway.

CONDITIONS: For the County to Utilize

1. Provide Aviation Easements to the Desert Resorts Airport prior to any development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Any acoustical study for the site should include noise from the overflying aircraft within the analysis and discuss mitigations.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into all residential construction and the office portions of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. All prospective tenants shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and all tenants shall sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will likely increase significantly in the future.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Commission find the project consistent with the Thermal Airport Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Cobb called for members of the audience wishing to voice their opposition to the project to come forward, and upon hearing no reply from the audience he called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

A discussion then ensued between Vice Chairman Graff, Keith Downs and Chairman Cobb pertaining to the projects close proximity to the runway, noise attenuation and lack of noise buffering resulting in modification to Condition of

Approval #3 to read as: "Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portion of any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels."

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's recommendations and modification to Condition of Approval #3. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Items I, J, K and M were approved based upon the Consent Calendar method/format.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

9:45 A.M.

- I. RI-02-113 – Airport Mini Storage – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-113 – Airport Mini Storage
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: RZ 017-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a permit to construct an additional 12,000 sq. ft. of Mini-Storage buildings on a 23,189 sq. ft. parcel.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7044 Arlington Avenue approximately 150 feet south of Arlington Avenue within the City of Riverside and approximately 700-900 feet southerly of the end Runway 16/31 at the Riverside Airport. The site is within 100 feet of a flight track centerline.

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted April 1998*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ)*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 700- 900 feet southerly of Runway 16/31 and is within the Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for the construction of 12,000 sq. ft. of self-storage in five buildings on .6 acres. The ETZ allows no population and no obstructions. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is 50% of the gross area.*

NOISE: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

PART 77: The elevation at the site is 750 MSL. The height of the structures is 10 feet. The site is within the 20:1 visual approach surface at this location, which has a clearance of 25-35 feet over the site. The runway end elevation is 748 MSL. An FAA 7460 review is required.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed and any required lighting shall be included in construction.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

Upon hearing no opposition from any members of the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- J. RI-02-114 – Magnolia Ave. Baptist Church – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-114 - Magnolia Avenue Baptist Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 020-712

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A request to construct an additional 166 spaces of parking to an existing church.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is at 8405 Magnolia Ave and is situated northerly of Magnolia Avenue and east of Wayne Court within the City of Riverside, and approximately 7,200 feet southerly of the east end of the Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ

b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 7,200 feet south of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is to build add 166 parking spaces. The plan as adopted describes churches as 'discouraged uses', but allows those preexisting uses to expand or be modified.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 798 feet and the maximum building height is 20 feet. The site and is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL. Any structure over 900MSL would need an FAA review.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project.

Upon hearing no opposition from any members of the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- K. RI-02-119 – Shah Produce Market – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-119 – Shah Produce Market
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Conditional Use Permit

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a Convenience Store consisting of approximately 2,120 sq. ft. in an existing retail center.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed site is located at 5503 Van Buren Blvd, north of Philbin Avenue within the City

of Riverside, approximately 3,600 ft. southwest of Runway 16/34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The site is located approximately 3,600 ft. southwest of Runway 16/34 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a convenience store consisting of approximately 2,120 sq. ft. in an existing retail center. The present proposal would be consistent with the land use provisions outlined in the CLUP.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 740MSL feet and the maximum height of the existing structure is approximately 25 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

Upon hearing no opposition from any members of the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff’s Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- L. RI-02-121 – Templo La Roca Firme Plad – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-121 - Templo La Roca Firme Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 048-643

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
A request to construct an additional 2,390 sq. ft. to an existing church.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated southerly of California St. and west of Adams Avenue, within the City of

Riverside, and approximately 4,800 feet southerly of the east end of the Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ

b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 4,800 feet south of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is to add an additional 2,390 sq. ft. to the church. The plan as adopted describes churches as 'discouraged uses', but allows those preexisting uses to expand or be modified.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 775 feet and the maximum building height is 16 feet. The site and is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL. Any structure over 900MSL would need an FAA review.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Ron Vergilio came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation. Vice Chairman Graff inquired if the project consisted of a classroom for daycare, and if so would it be 5 days. Mr. Vergilio responded that it only included Sunday Bible Study. Chairman Cobb then asked Mr. Vergilio if he was in concurrence with the Conditions of Approval, to which he responded positively.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- M. RI-02-122 – Advocate Schools – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-122 - Advocate Schools
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request to add four Additional Classrooms totaling 5,760 sq. ft. to an existing facility.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated at 8880 Magnolia Ave., within the City of Riverside, and approximately 7,600 feet southerly of the east end of the Riverside Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

*a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 7600 feet south of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is to place an additional 5,760 sq. ft. of teaching facilities. The plan as adopted describes schools as 'discouraged uses', but allows those preexisting uses to expand or be modified.*

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 784MSL feet and the maximum building height is 20 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL. Any structure over 900MSL would need an FAA review.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project.

Upon hearing no opposition from any members of the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Adkison made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

10:15 A.M.

- N. FV-02-103 – Riverside County – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-103 – Riverside County
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP17666

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for PP 17666 for construction of a 240,000 sq. ft. Business Park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the northeast corner of Briggs Road and Auld Road, southerly of Benton Road in the County of Riverside, 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 and 60 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that a portion of the property is currently inside of the 55db CNEL, with a smaller portion inside of the 60 CNEL. The CLUP indicates that noise sensitive commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

Land Use:

The site is located 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36, and 1200 ft. north of the north end of the proposed runway, to be located 600 ft. east of Runway 18/36. The proposed land use is commercial, and consists of a 240,000 sq. ft. business park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

The site consists of six Planning Areas, zoned Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC), as shown on the attached exhibit. Planning Area 1 (4.93 ac.) is located within the Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ). Planning Area 2 (15 ac.) is within the ISZ for Runway 18/36 and is also within the ETZ and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) for the proposed runway. Planning Area 3 (8.59 ac.) is primarily within the OSZ of the proposed runway, although the southeast corner is within the TPZ. Planning Area 4 (7.86 ac) is within the ISZ of Runway 18/36, and is also within the ETZ and OSZ for the proposed runway. Planning Areas 5 (9.4 ac.) and 6 (13.4 ac.) are within the ISZ and ETZ for Runway 18/36. The proposed buildings on the site or a portion of the proposed buildings are either within the ISZ for Runway 18/36, the ETZ for the proposed runway, or the OSZ for the proposed runway.

A portion of the building within Planning Area 1 is in the TPZ, with the remaining portion in the ISZ.

Prohibited and Discouraged Uses

Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade powerlines are prohibited within the ISZ. Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ. Prohibited land uses within the OSZ include residences, public assembly uses, hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include schools, auditoriums, amphitheatres, stadiums, churches, and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials.

Building coverage for Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 is less than 25% (net), which is below the OSZ standard of 25% (net). The maximum population density within the OSZ is 25 persons per acre for uses in structures.

There is a GPS approach over the site (non-precision). A 34:1 approach would typically place an approaching aircraft 200 feet ± over the proposed site.

Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1354 MSL. The building, signs and lighting at the proposed site are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The proposed site is located within the Part 77 approach surface overlying this area at 1,350 – 1,410MSL. The runway elevation is 1,347MSL. The distance from Runway 18/36 to the closest building on the proposed site is approximately 950 ft.

Planning Areas 5 and 6, and the western portion of Planning Area 4 lie to the west of the Building Restriction Line (BRL) established in accordance with FAR Part 77 criteria. Buildings to be constructed within Planning Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the proposed site are restricted to those portions of the site east of the BRL. The BRL does not extend into or lie adjacent to Planning Area 1.

The applicant is submitting a 7460 Notice to Construct to the FAA at the request of staff, and is awaiting a response.

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends continuance of the item until May in order to obtain the 7460 review and any comments from Caltrans Aeronautics.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb asked for clarification of the word ‘nursery’ and inquired whether it meant a nursery for plants. Beverly Coleman indicated it was a plant nursery.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Terms of Office/Reappointments

Keith Downs indicated that two new Commissioners may be in attendance at the next meeting. He further added that Lyle Alberg was appointed by his alternate, and that the Clerk of the Board has sent their nominee information, which nominated Mr. Bell. Mr. Downs continued by stating that the Board of Supervisor’s

has been appointed to the City Selection Committee, and that the Airport Manager's nomination letter was sent out.

Keith Downs added that Paul Bell and Allen Graff are all board appointees.

He also noted that the Consultant will be available on May 23rd, and suggesting moving the next ALUC meeting to that date for concurrence. Commissioner Bell and Chairman Cobb both noted conflicts for this date and advised on holding the meeting for its regularly scheduled date of May 16th.

B. Hemet Letter, March 26, 2002

Keith Downs indicated that the letter addressed to Richard Masyczek denotes PCD exemption (i.e. church) and directed the Commissioners to Pages 31 & 32 of the Hemet/Ryan text. B.T. Miller noted conformance with non-exemption for French Valley Cases involving a gas station, which was exempt although deemed as consistent.

Mr. Downs noted that the text disagrees with the interpretation. Commissioner Snyder and Chairman Cobb agreed and suggested drafting another letter.

Commissioner Alberg abstained from the voting process.

ACTION TAKEN: Chairman Cobb made a motion to 'draft' another letter to Richard Masyczek denoting clarification, Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. CLUP Date: Issue of the Month

Keith indicated that it is his desire to issued paper for each meeting a continue discussion each month.

Commissioner Adkison advised that the March CLUP has possibly secured Federal funding per congressman Ken Calvert. He also added that the letter from Keith Downs had been received and that regular monies for update (processing) was pending an answer. Chairman Cobb inquired if this would piggyback the CLUP implementation, to which Keith Downs responded positively.

After which time an award of Chairman Cobb on behalf of the ALUC presented appreciation and accommodations to Commissioner Adkison. Commissioner in return voiced his appreciation of the ALUC as follows:

"Whereas, on September 1996, Ed Adkison was appointed a member of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission; and,

Whereas, during the entire period he gave unstintingly of his time in the furtherance of good land use planning for the County as a whole; and

Whereas, he has at all times, with unselfishness under all conditions and in all matters pertaining to airport land use planning, exerted honest, sincere and efficient effort on behalf of the people of the County of Riverside; and,

Whereas, during his term as Commissioner, he had served as Chairman of the Commission in 2000 and 2001; and

Whereas, during this chairmanship, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission undertook several complicated and controversial cases; and

Whereas, he has diligently pursued funding for the MARB/MIP Land Use Plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission through this Resolution, desires to express its sincere appreciation for the efficient and outstanding service, which Ed Adkison has rendered to this County.”

VII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

None

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

- X. Adjournment: Chairman Adkison adjourned the meeting at 12:43 p.m.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: May 16, 2002 at 9:00 a.m.